United Nations A/C.3/54/SR.56

General Assembly
Fifty-fourth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
21 December 1999

Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 56th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Monday, 22 November 1999, at 8 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Galuška ..... (Czech Republic)

Contents

Agenda item 116: Human rights questions (*continued*)

(c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*)

(e) Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (*continued*)

Agenda item 114: Elimination of racism and racial discrimination (*continued*)

Agenda item 12: Report of the Economic and Social Council (*continued*)

Completion of the Committee's work.

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

99-82571 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 8.35 p.m.

Agenda item 116: Human rights questions (*continued*)

(c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives (*continued*) (A/C.3/54/L.63, 82, 86, 96 and 97)

Draft resolution A/C.3/54/L.82: The situation of human rights in Kosovo and the amendments thereto contained in document A/C.3/54/L.97

1. **The Chairman** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.3/54/L.82 and the amendments thereto contained in document A/C.3/54/L.97. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

2. **Mr. Carle** (United States of America), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said Croatia, Israel and Poland had become sponsors. He thanked the members of the Committee for their cooperation and said that, thanks to the efforts of a number of key delegations, he was able to suggest a revision to the draft resolution which would make it more acceptable. A new preambular paragraph should be added after the second preambular paragraph, to read: "*Recalling*, against the background of years of repression, intolerance and violence in Kosovo, the challenge to build a multi-ethnic society on the basis of substantial autonomy, respecting the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro), pending final settlement in accordance with Security Council resolution 1244 (1999)".

3. **Mr. Zmeevski** (Russian Federation) said that, in the light of the new oral revision proposed by the United States representative, his delegation would withdraw its amendments contained in document A/C.3/54/L.97. He nevertheless requested a recorded vote and said that his delegation would vote against the draft resolution. He was concerned that any attempt to build a multi-ethnic Kosovo outside the framework of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia could prove to be a pipe dream that would entail new evils for the whole of Europe. No European Power would countenance that. His Government was seriously concerned also that some participants in the Europe-wide process were not prepared to accept the wording agreed upon in respect of Kosovo at the recent summit meeting of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), held in Istanbul.

4. The references in the draft resolution to the "Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro)"were archaic and were unacceptable to his delegation. Moreover, the draft resolution was remarkable for its one-sided and selective reading of the Kosovo tragedy. According to the Special Rapporteur, many violations of human rights currently being perpetrated by non-State actors in Kosovo were not dissimilar to those which had preceded the intervention by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). The Special Rapporteur had also warned that there might ultimately be no Serbs left in Kosovo south of the Ibar river. The ethnic cleansing of Serbs, Roma and Bosniacs must not be viewed with indifference. Glossing over the brutal realities of the current situation in Kosovo would not bring the international community any closer to restoring the faith of the inhabitants of the province in fundamental human rights; indeed, rather the reverse. It was for that reason that his delegation was requesting a recorded vote on the draft resolution and would vote against it. However, it did welcome the oral revision proposed by the United States delegation, in that it affirmed the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the autonomous status of Kosovo within it.

5. **Ms. de Armas Garcia** (Cuba), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that her delegation would abstain. The draft resolution did not paint an accurate and objective picture of the human rights situation in Kosovo, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. She deplored the systematic violations of Security Council resolution 1244 (1999) in the province, especially with regard to the sovereignty of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia over Kosovo and noted that the resolution condoned the military intervention by NATO. Her delegation could never accept such a flagrant violation of international principles and of the Charter of the United Nations. The United Nations was also failing in its duty to protect all the inhabitants of the province, since killings and kidnappings of Serbs, Roma and other ethnic minorities continued. She was concerned about the fate of all victims of violence and human rights violations and hoped that all ethnic groups in Kosovo would be guaranteed the full enjoyment of human rights.

6. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/54/L.82, as orally revised.*

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan,

Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Belarus, India, Russian Federation.

Abstaining:

Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Guinea, Jamaica, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mali, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Panama, Peru, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Singapore, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukraine, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela.

7. *Draft resolution A/C.3/54/L.82, as orally revised, was adopted by 101 votes to 3, with 36 abstentions.*

8. **Mr. Umeda** (Japan) said that his delegation shared the concern of the international community about the human rights situation of all groups, especially minority groups, in Kosovo and called for full implementation of draft resolution A/C.3/54/L.82. He was especially concerned about the situation of refugees and displaced persons and stressed that the international community must ensure the safe return of, and adequate accommodation for, all refugees and displaced persons. His Government was working with all actors involved to create a safe environment, which was essential for the safe return of those who had been forced to flee. New reports of continuing bloodshed and human rights violations were not encouraging and the international community must therefore redouble its efforts. His delegation would work to ensure continued assistance to resolve the situation.

Draft resolution A/C.3/54/L.86 on: Situation of human rights in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Republic of Croatia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro), and the amendment thereto contained in document A/C.3/54/L.96

9. **The Chairman** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.3/54/L.86 and the amendment thereto contained in document A/C.3/54/L.96. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

10. **Mr. Carle** (United States of America) announced that Austria, Belgium, Canada, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Morocco, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Sweden, and the United Kingdom had also become sponsors. As a result of recent consultations, the sponsors wished to add a new preambular paragraph after the third preambular paragraph, to read: "*Reaffirming also* the territorial integrity of all States in the region, within their internationally recognized borders, taking fully into account all relevant Security Council resolutions".

11. **The Chairman** noted that Andorra, Iceland, Israel, Jordan, Liechtenstein, Malta, Monaco and San Marino wished to become sponsors.

12. **Mr. Zmeevski** (Russian Federation) said that, in the light of the oral revision read out by the United States representative, his delegation would withdraw its amendment contained in document A/C.3/54/L.96. His delegation felt that draft resolution A/C.3/54/L.86 gave the events taking place in the territory of the former Yugoslavia a biased interpretation.

13. Section III of the draft resolution was particularly tendentious in its relation of events in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia: it broke the historical link by leaving out of the account the tragic events that had destroyed the peaceful life of the inhabitants of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. Moreover, its use of the formula "Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro)"was a patent anachronism, especially in the light of the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and other United Nations bodies and the wording agreed to at the recent OSCE meeting in Istanbul. Those deficiencies violated one of the key principles of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action, in that Governments bore the primary responsibility for the protection and promotion of human rights. States did not act in a vacuum but rather within delimited territories that were protected by international law. Section III was therefore unacceptable to his delegation. Accordingly, his delegation requested a recorded vote on section III and would vote against it. His delegation nevertheless supported

the oral revision made by the United States delegation, in that it reaffirmed the territorial integrity of all States in the region, within their internationally recognized borders, taking fully into account all relevant Security Council resolutions. That principle was crucial. His delegation also requested a separate recorded vote on sections I and II taken together, in which it would abstain, and a recorded vote on draft resolution A/C.3/54/L.86 as a whole, in which it would vote against the draft resolution.

14. *A recorded vote was taken on section III of draft resolution A/C.3/54/L.86.*

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Belarus, China, Russian Federation.

Abstaining:

Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Benin, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Eritrea, Ethiopia, India, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Singapore, South Africa, Togo, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania.

15. *Section III of draft resolution A/C.3/54/L.86 was adopted by 105 votes to 3, with 26 abstentions.*

16. *A recorded vote was taken on sections I and II of draft resolution A/C.3/54/L.86.*

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Latvia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

None.

Abstaining:

Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Belarus, Benin, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, China, Croatia, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Eritrea, Ethiopia, India, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Singapore, South Africa, Togo, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania.

17. *Sections I and II of draft resolution A/C.3/54/L.86 were adopted by 107 votes to none, with 28 abstentions.*

18. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/54/L.86 as a whole, as orally revised.*

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Latvia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Belarus, Russian Federation.

Abstaining:

Angola, Benin, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, China, Croatia, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Guinea, India, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mali, Mexico, Myanmar, Namibia, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Singapore, Togo, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania.

19. *Draft resolution A/C.3/54/L.86 as a whole, as orally revised, was adopted by 112 votes to 2, with 26 abstentions.*

20. **Ms. Šimonović** (Croatia) said that her delegation had abstained because the preambular paragraphs, especially the fifth preambular paragraph, did not accurately reflect the improvement in the human rights situation in Croatia. She felt that Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) and the Republic of Croatia should no longer automatically be considered together and also that a clear distinction should be made between the human rights situation in the different countries. Croatia was now a full participant in the Council of Europe, which involved accepting of the Council's minority standards and monitoring mechanisms, as well as the jurisdiction of the European Court of Human Rights. It was also continuing to cooperate with OSCE human rights monitoring missions. The human rights situation in her country was greatly improved and her Government would continue to seek the help of its international and regional partners in order to improve its implementation of accepted international norms and promote democratization.

Draft resolution A/C.3/54/L.63: Situation of human rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo

21. **The Chairman** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.3/54/L.63, which had been orally revised at the Committee's 54th meeting. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

22. **Mr. Mwamba Kapanga** (Democratic Republic of the Congo) requested a recorded vote on the draft resolution and said that, unfortunately, his delegation would not be able to support it. As currently worded, the draft resolution still did not recognize that the worst human rights violations had been and continued to be committed by the troops of the so-called uninvited countries. In that context, and referring to paragraph 4 (i), he noted that the Government of Rwanda had suspended cooperation with the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda. He stressed the need to protect the human rights of all the population in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, both in areas under Government control and in areas occupied by the forces of uninvited countries. He regretted having to vote against the draft resolution, but believed that allowing it to be adopted by consensus would only serve to encourage the aggressors in the eastern part of the country.

23. **Mr. Schalin** (Finland), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, expressed regret that there was no consensus. He believed the revised text to be a balanced one: paragraph 2 (b) referred specifically to the situation in the eastern parts of the country and paragraph 3 referred to all parties to the conflict. He stressed that the delegation of the Democratic Republic of the Congo had succeeded in making improvements to the text during discussions, and he therefore hoped that all delegations would support the draft resolution.

24. **Mr. Musenga** (Rwanda) stressed his Government's commitment to a peaceful resolution of the situation in the

Democratic Republic of the Congo. As a neighbouring country, Rwanda was inevitably affected by that situation. With regard to the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda, his Government's cooperation had been suspended temporarily in reaction to the release of an important accused criminal.

25. **Mr. Odaga-Jalomayo** (Uganda) said that his Government has no territorial ambitions or special economic interests in the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and stressed its commitment to a peaceful solution of the conflict and to the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement. Full implementation of that Agreement was the key to peace in the subregion. The Agreement recognized that the conflict had both internal and external dimensions and reaffirmed the need to address the security concerns of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and neighbouring countries.

26. He regretted that the draft resolution before the Committee did not focus clearly and objectively on the human rights situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Parts of the draft resolution, especially paragraph 2 (b) (i), were misleading and could result in confusion which would undermine peace efforts. His delegation, therefore, could not support the draft resolution and would abstain in the vote on it.

27. **Mr. Nteturuye** (Burundi) expressed concern at the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and called on all signatories to the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement, including invited and uninvited forces and the Democratic Republic of the Congo and neighbouring countries, to work towards the restoration of peace in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and in the subregion.

28. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/54/L.63, as orally revised.*

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kuwait, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Against:

Chad, China, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Myanmar, Sudan, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia.

29. *Draft resolution A/C.3/54/L.63, as orally revised, was adopted by 80 votes to 8, with 47 abstentions.*

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*) (A/54/222 and Add.1, A/C.3/54/L.62, 84, 85 and 101)

Draft resolution A/C.3/54/L.62: Human rights and cultural diversity, and the amendments thereto contained in A/C.3/54/L.101

30. **The Chairman** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.3/54/L.62 and the amendments thereto contained in document A/C.3/54/L.101. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

31. **Mr. Alaee** (Islamic Republic of Iran), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said that El Salvador, Indonesia, Kenya, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Morocco had also become sponsors. Following further consultations, agreement had been reached on revisions to the draft resolution, which were being distributed. He hoped that they would be acceptable to members of the Committee.

32. **Mr. Schalin** (Finland), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the European Union countries would join in the consensus on the revised text and would therefore withdraw the amendments contained in document A/C.3/54/L.101.

33. **The Chairman** said he took it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.3/54/L.62, as revised, without a vote.

34. *It was so decided.*

35. **Mr. Umeda** (Japan) stressed the importance of human rights and cultural diversity for the dignity of humankind. While he was not entirely satisfied with the text of the resolution, he thanked the sponsors for the flexibility which they had shown in order to achieve a consensus. The revised text was acceptable as a basis for future discussion.

Draft resolution A/C.3/54/84: Enhancement of international cooperation in the field of human rights

36. **The Chairman** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.3/54/L.84 which had no programme budget implications.

37. **Mr. Montwedi** (South Africa), speaking on behalf of the Movement of Non-aligned Countries and China, proposed the following revisions to the draft resolution: in the first preambular paragraph, the entire text beginning "on the enhancement ..." and ending "... (2001-2010)," should be deleted, and the words "as well as General Assembly resolution 53/22 of 4 November 1998 on the United Nations Year of Dialogue among Civilizations" should be inserted at the end of the paragraph; in the fourth line of the second preambular paragraph, the words "in order to enhance" should be replaced by "for enhancing"; the fifth preambular paragraph should be deleted; in the fourth line of the sixth preambular paragraph; the word "welcoming" should be replaced by "noting"; in the second line of paragraph 2, the words "to continue" should be inserted after the word "organizations", and in the second and third lines, the words "intercultural", "as a salient part of the dialogue among civilizations" and "to continue" should be deleted. In the light of those revisions, he called on the Committee to adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

38. **The Chairman** said he took it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.3/54/L.84, as orally revised, without a vote.

39. *It was so decided.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/54/L.85: The right to development

40. **The Chairman** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.3/54/L.85, which had no programme budget implications.

41. **Mr. Montwedi** (South Africa), speaking on behalf of the Movement of Non-aligned Countries and China, thanked those delegations which had shown their commitment to the promotion of the right to development, thereby bringing the Committee close to a consensus. He called on the Committee to adopt the draft resolution without a vote. In the event of a recorded vote, he called on the traditional sponsors of the resolution on the right to development to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

42. **Mr. Schalin** (Finland), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that, unfortunately, the draft resolution still referred to many issues which would be better discussed in another context. The approach taken in the text to sanctions, conditionality and a proposed convention on the right to development continued to pose problems. He therefore requested a recorded vote on the eighth and thirteenth preambular paragraphs and paragraphs 3 (c), 3 (e), 13, 21 and 22, taken together, and said that the European Union countries would vote against those paragraphs.

43. **Mr. Tapia** (Chile) said that, while recognizing the importance of a consensus on the right to development, he unfortunately shared many of the reservations concerning the draft resolution. The use of sanctions was simply the international community's response to a State's failure to live up to its international obligation to protect and promote human rights. He felt that the thirteenth preambular paragraph could be deleted, since conditionality was an effective tool for the promotion of human rights. The Rio Group, for example, had adopted clear criteria concerning democracy and human rights.

44. Despite those reservations, his country, which was a member of the Non-aligned Movement, would support the draft resolution and would continue to work towards consensus in the important area of the right to development.

45. **Ms. Eckey** (Norway), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, expressed regret that a consensus had not been possible on the draft resolution. Norway attached great importance to the right to development and to human rights and supported efforts to promote them both bilaterally and multilaterally. The protection of the rights of individuals in the development process and the building of democratic institutions based on law were priorities for her Government. Unfortunately, the draft resolution had been weakened by the inclusion of the sanctions issue and macroeconomic issues, as well as by the selective references contained in paragraphs 12, 21 and 22. The right to development called for human rights to be viewed comprehensively and confrontation must be avoided in order to allow all parties to concentrate their efforts on the promotion of human rights at the international and national levels.

46. **Mr. Zmeevski** (Russian Federation) requested a separate recorded vote on each of the paragraphs mentioned by the representative of Finland.

47. *A recorded vote was taken on the eighth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.3/54/L.85.*

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Croatia, Republic of Korea.

48. The eighth preambular paragraph was adopted by 90 votes to 39, with 2 abstentions.*

49. *A recorded vote was taken on the thirteenth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.3/54/L.85.*

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

None.

50. *The thirteenth preambular paragraph was adopted by 91 votes to 40.***

51. *A recorded vote was taken on paragraph 3 (c) of draft resolution A/C.3/54/L.85.*

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde,

* The delegation of the Congo subsequently informed the Committee that it had intended to vote in favour of the eighth preambular paragraph.

** The delegation of the Congo subsequently informed the Committee that it had intended to vote in favour of the thirteenth preambular paragraph.

Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Cyprus, Republic of Korea.

52. *Paragraph 3 (c) was adopted by 94 votes to 38, with 2 abstentions.*[*]

53. *A recorded vote was taken on paragraph 3 (e) of draft resolution A/C.3/54/L.85.*

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Georgia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Abstaining:

None.

54. *Paragraph 3 (e) was adopted by 96 votes to 36.*[**]

55. *A recorded vote was taken on paragraph 13 of draft resolution A/C.3/54/L.85.*

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia,

[*] The delegation of the Congo subsequently informed the Committee that it had intended to vote in favour of paragraph 3 (c).

[**] The delegation of the Congo subsequently informed the Committee that it had intended to vote in favour of paragraph 3 (e).

Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

None.

56. *Paragraph 13 was adopted by 92 votes to 41.**

57. *A recorded vote was taken on paragraph 21 of draft resolution A/C.3/54/L.85.*

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Russian Federation, Ukraine.

58. *Paragraph 21 was adopted by 90 votes to 41, with 2 abstentions.***

59. *A recorded vote was taken on paragraph 22 of draft resolution A/C.3/54/L.85.*

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Georgia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland,

* The delegation of the Congo subsequently informed the Committee that it had intended to vote in favour of paragraph 13.

** The delegation of the Congo subsequently informed the Committee that it had intended to vote in favour of paragraph 21.

Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

None.

60. *Paragraph 22 was adopted by 93 votes to 39.**

61. **Mr. Goledzinowski** (Australia) said that his delegation would abstain in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole, since it had a number of reservations about the content. From a technical standpoint, the draft resolution, if adopted, would require the preparation of up to eight separate reports annually. Paragraph 16 would require the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights to report to her own independent expert, which he deemed inappropriate, and paragraph 22 would require the independent expert to submit comprehensive reports on poverty, structural adjustment, globalization, financial and trade liberalization and deregulation to the Commission on Human Rights at its fifty-sixth session, for which the reporting deadline was 31 December 1999. However, the independent expert was already fully occupied preparing for the forthcoming meeting of the open-ended working group on the right to development, to be held in Geneva.

62. While he agreed with the representative of South Africa that the Committee had been close to a consensus during discussions, he believed that the substantive problems presented by the draft resolution were even more worrying. He regretted that the views of his own and other delegations had not been reflected in the final text. Broad agreement had been reached on most issues which traditionally fell within the scope of the right to development, but no agreement had been reached on the question of a convention on the right to development, which he hoped would be taken up by the open-ended working group, or on the issue of sanctions, which was already under discussion elsewhere in the United Nations system. The Committee must find some common ground, and he feared that the draft resolution in its current form would not make the task of the open-ended working group any easier. He hoped that before the next session of the General Assembly, all members of the Third Committee would reflect on the meaning of the right to development and on measures to promote that right.

63. **Mr. Hynes** (Canada) expressed regret that no consensus had been possible. His delegation shared the concerns expressed by the representatives of Chile, Finland and Norway regarding sanctions and conditionality, among other issues; it had voted against the paragraphs in question and would vote against the draft resolution as a whole. He was also concerned that paragraph 5 referred to the "right to development of many developing countries". That wording did not correspond to Canada's conception of the right to development, nor was it consistent with the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action; paragraph 2 was more accurate in referring to "the right to development for every human person". He believed that the right to development meant the right of individuals to benefit from the international community's efforts to promote and protect the economic, social, cultural, political and civil rights of all persons, as guaranteed by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other instruments. He hoped that that definition would serve as the basis for discussions within the Commission on Human Rights with a view to reaching a consensus.

64. **Mr. Umeda** (Japan), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that adoption of the draft resolution by consensus would have been an important first step towards ensuring the success of the working group on the right to development which was to meet in Geneva in a few weeks. Unfortunately, some elements of the draft resolution were unacceptable. The references to sanctions in the eighth preambular paragraph and in paragraph 13 failed to take into account the need to make a comprehensive study of the circumstances surrounding sanctions. With regard to the reference to conditionality in the thirteenth preambular paragraph, his Government viewed development assistance not only as a tool for the promotion of the economy of countries but also as an important tool for the promotion and protection of fundamental human rights and the establishment of democracy. The human rights situation in recipient countries was therefore an important element in any decision on development assistance. Lastly, while he acknowledged the influence of macroeconomic factors on human rights, he felt that it was inappropriate to include references to macroeconomic elements until further work had been done to clarify the relationship between those elements and human rights. His delegation would therefore vote against the draft resolution as a whole.

65. **Mr. Hynes** (Canada) said that it was clear that many delegations wished to have their position on the draft resolution recorded. He therefore requested that a recorded vote be taken on the draft resolution as a whole.

* The delegation of the Congo subsequently informed the Committee that it had intended to vote in favour of paragraph 22.

66. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/54/L.85 as a whole.*

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Canada, Denmark, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Japan, Liechtenstein, Netherlands, Sweden, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Greece, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

67. *Draft resolution A/C.3/54/L.85 as a whole was adopted by 98 votes to 10, with 32 abstentions.*

Report of the Secretary-General on human rights and unilateral coercive measures (A/54/222 and Add.1)

Draft decision

68. **The Chairman** proposed that the Committee recommend to the General Assembly that it take note of the report of the Secretary-General on human rights and unilateral coercive measures (A/54/222 and Add.1).

69. *It was so decided.*

(e) Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (*continued*) (A/54/36)

Draft decision

70. **The Chairman** proposed that the Committee recommend to the General Assembly that it take note of the report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (A/54/36).

71. *It was so decided.*

72. **The Chairman** said that the Committee had completed its consideration of agenda item 116.

Agenda item 114: Elimination of racism and racial discrimination (*continued*) (A/54/18 and Add.1)

Report of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (A/54/18 and Add.1)

Draft decision

73. **The Chairman** proposed that the Committee recommend to the General Assembly that it take note of the report of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (A/54/18 and Add.1) and that it decide to refer the issue contained in decision 4(55) back to the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination for further consideration, in the light of the information contained in document A/54/18/Add.1 of 17 November 1999, in particular paragraph 9 thereof.

74. *It was so decided.*

75. **The Chairman** said that the Committee had completed its consideration of agenda item 114.

Agenda item 12: Report of the Economic and Social Council (*continued*) (A/C.3/54/L.100)

Organization of work of the Third Committee and draft biennial programme of work of the Committee for 2000-2001 (A/C.3/54/L.100)

76. **The Chairman** invited the Committee to consider document A/C.3/54/L.100, on the organization of work of the Third Committee and the draft biennial programme of work of the Committee for 2000-2001.

77. **Mr. Xiong Lixian** (Chief, Documentation, Programming and Monitoring Unit, Department of General

Assembly Affairs and Conference Services) introduced the document and made some revisions. In annex I, section E, under item 3 (Annual), the entry "Question of the elaboration of an international convention against organized transnational crime" should be deleted; under item 4 (Biennial), the entry "Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances (even years)"should be deleted; under item 10 (Annual), the entry "Status of the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid" should be deleted; under item 11 (Annual), the first paragraph should be deleted and the third paragraph should end at "self-determination"; and under item 12 (b) (Annual), the entry "Protection of United Nations personnel" should be deleted. In annex II, under item 4, the entry "Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances (even years)"should be deleted; under item 7, the heading "Questions for consideration for which no advance documentation has been requested" and the last entry, on the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, should be deleted; and under item 12 (d), the heading "Questions for consideration for which no documentation has been requested" should be deleted.

78. **Ms. Štiglic** (Slovenia) noted that in item 10 in annex I, the entry "Report of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination under "Annual" should be moved to "Biennial" and should end with the indication"(even years)".

79. **Ms. Enkhtsetseg** (Mongolia) said that in annex I, under item 2 (Biennial), the entry "Cooperation to achieve education for all" should be replaced by "United Nations Literacy Decade", in accordance with paragraph 11 of resolution A/C.3/54/L.10.

80. **The Chairman** said he took it that the Committee wished to adopt document A/C.3/54/L.100, as orally revised and amended.

81. *It was so decided.*

Report of the Economic and Social Council (A/54/3)

Draft decision

82. **The Chairman** proposed that the Committee take note of the report of the Economic and Social Council contained in document A/54/3, in particular, chapters I, III, IV, V, VII (sections A, C and I) and IX, which had been allocated to the Third Committee.

83. *It was so decided.*

84. **The Chairman** said that the Committee had completed its consideration of agenda item 12.

Completion of the Committee's work

85. After an exchange of courtesies, in which *Ms. Mesdoua* (Algeria), *Ms. Nguyen Thi Nha* (Viet Nam), *Ms. Akbar* (Antigua and Barbuda), *Mr. Schalin* (Finland) and *Ms. Raguž* (Croatia) spoke on behalf of the regional groups of States, the Chairman declared that the Third Committee had completed its work for the fifty-fourth session.

The meeting rose at 11.15 p.m.